

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 17 are in the case. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the present invention is a continuous process, which is distinguishable from the non-continuous process prior art references cited in the Examiner's office action. Claims 2 through 17 have been cancelled. New claims 18 through 50 have been added to the case. No new subject matter has been added. The new claims find support in the specification particularly at the following positions:

Claim 18	Original claim 1
Claim 19	Original claim 12
Claim 20	Original claim 10
Claim 21	Original claim 11
Claim 22	pg. 2, lines 21-22, pg. 9, lines 9-11
Claim 23	pg. 2, lines 21-22
Claim 24	Original claim 16
Claim 25	Original claim 15
Claim 26	pg. 6, lines 4-6
Claim 27	pg. 6, lines 17-18
Claim 28	pg. 6, lines 17-18
Claim 29	pg. 6, lines 17-18
Claim 30	pg. 7, lines 23-25
Claim 31	Original claim 2
Claim 32	pg. 8, lines 1-3
Claim 33	pg. 8, lines 1-3
Claim 34	pg. 8, lines 5-8
Claim 35	pg. 8, lines 5-8
Claim 36	pg. 8, lines 8-10
Claim 37	Original claim 2

Claim 38	Original claim 5
Claim 39	Original claim 6
Claim 40	Original claim 7
Claim 41	Original claim 8
Claim 42	Original claim 9
Claim 43	pg. 7, lines 23-25, pg. 9, lines 1-20, pg. 10, lines 12-15
Claim 44	pg. 10, lines 15-17
Claim 45	pg. 10, lines 17-20
Claim 46	pg. 10, lines 17-20
Claim 47	pg. 6, lines 17-18
Claim 48	pg. 11, lines 4-16
Claim 49	pg. 11, lines 18-20
Claim 50	pg. 11, lines 22-26

Information Disclosure Statement

Herein, the Applicants submit a Supplemental IDS with a copy of the missing reference and any appropriate fees.

Objection to the Abstract

Herein, the Applicants submit a replacement Abstract in proper form.

Objection to Claims 5 and 6

Original Claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled. New claims 38 and 39, which are based upon original claims 5 and 6 address the Examiner's concerns over the incomplete range recitation.

§102 and §103 Claim Rejections

As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the present invention is a continuous process, which is distinguishable from the non-continuous process prior art

references cited in the Examiner's office action. Neither JP-925 nor RO-697 describe a continuous process nor do they disclose all of the limitations of amended claim 1.

Applicant's submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent on claim 1 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

If any matters remain requiring further consideration, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the number given below so that such matters may be discussed and, if possible, promptly resolved.

Please address all correspondence in this Application to Mr. Frank C. Eymard, attorney of record, at the address of record.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'F. Eymard', with a long horizontal line extending to the right across the page.

Frank C. Eymard

Reg. No. 51,660

Albemarle Corporation

451 Florida Street

Patent Law Department

Baton Rouge LA US 70801-1765

Telephone: 225-388-7750

Facsimile: 225-291-4606